



North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

TO: File: Russian River; TMDL Development and Planning

FROM: Steve Butkus

DATE: June 2, 2014

SUBJECT: EVIDENCE OF WATER CONTACT RECREATION IMPAIRMENT IN THE

RUSSIAN RIVER WATERSHED

The North Coast Regional Water Board staff are developing Russian River Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for pathogen indicator bacteria to identify and control contamination impairing recreational water uses. Potential pathogen contamination has been identified in the Russian River Watershed leading to conclusion that the natural background levels of bacteriological quality are not being achieved in the mainstem Russian River and its tributaries, in violation of the Basin Plan's narrative Bacteria Water Quality Objective. The contamination identified has been linked to impairment of the water contact recreation (REC-1) and non-contact water recreation (REC-2) designated beneficial uses. *Escherichia coli (E. coli)* and *Bacteroides* bacteria concentrations were measured at numerous locations in the Russian River Watershed between 2001 and 2013 by the North Coast Regional Water Board and the Sonoma County Water Agency (NCRWQCB 2012, 2013a, 2013b).

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the evidence for non-attainment of the Bacteria Water Quality Objective collected as part of the Russian River Pathogen Indicator Bacteria TMDL process for use in interpreting the Bacteria Water Quality Objective in the 2012 303(d) and 305(b) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report.

Assessment of E. coli Bacteria Concentrations

E. coli bacteria are appropriate indicators of human health risk during water contact in recreational freshwaters for the Russian River Pathogen Indicator Bacteria TMDL. *E. coli* bacteria are specific to fecal material from humans and other warm blooded animals, and they are linked with illness rates in epidemiological studies. The *E. coli* bacteria concentration measurements were compared to the *E. coli* bacteria numeric evaluation threshold. Table 1 presents the numeric evaluation thresholds for E. coli bacteria concentration for the Russian River Pathogen Indicator Bacteria TMDL based on samples collected over a 30-day period. The thresholds are based on the U.S. EPA (2012) criteria that correspond to a rate of 36 illnesses per 1,000 water contact recreators.

Table 1. E. coli Bacteria Numeric Targets

| Pathogen | Estimated Illness Rate 36 per 1,000 recreators | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Indicator Bacteria | Geometric Mean (cfu/100mL) | Statistical Threshold Value (cfu/100mL) | |
| E. coli | 126 | 410 | |

Note: Colony forming units (cfu) = most probable number (MPN)

Water samples were analyzed for *E. coli* bacteria concentrations using the IDEXX Colilert method. IDEXX's Colilert® procedures have been adopted as standard methods for monitoring recreational water quality by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (IDDEX, 2001; USEPA, 2003). Water samples were either undiluted or serially diluted 1:10, resulting in a minimum reporting limit of 1 or 10 MPN/100mL and a maximum reporting limit of 2,419 or 24,196 MPN/100mL. Measurements beyond the analytical reporting limits (i.e., censored data) were substituted with the reporting limit value.

The REC-1 beneficial use impairment was assessed using the numeric evaluation threshold and Table 3.2 of the *Water Quality Control Policy for California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List* (CSWRCB 2004), which is also known as the Listing Policy. The Listing policy applies a binomial distribution for listing decisions that minimizes decision error based on sample size and number of samples exceeding the criteria. In order to meet the statistical assumptions required for the application of the binomial distribution, *E. coli* bacteria concentrations were assessed using discrete 30-day averaging periods (Butkus 2013). Discrete 30-day periods were defined based on the Julian calendar date of each year (i.e., 30-day period 1 for Julian days 1-30; 30-day period 2 for Julian days 31-60, etc.).

The results of the assessment for *E. coli* bacteria concentrations are presented in Table 2. The table also indicates if the number of exceedances of the numeric threshold were high enough for the stream to be considered impaired per the Listing Policy. The results verify that there is evidence of REC-1 impairment due to high *E. coli* bacteria concentrations in five (5) tributaries of the Russian River Watershed.

Table 2. Impaired Russian River Tributaries from E. coli bacteria by Location

| Location | Number of 30-day Periods Sampled | Number of Periods that Exceed Numeric Evaluation Threshold* | Considered Impaired per §303(d) Listing Policy |
|--|---|---|--|
| Foss Creek at Matheson Street | 7 | 6 | Yes |
| Green Valley Creek at Martinelli Road and River Road | 11 | 7 | Yes |
| Laguna de Santa Rosa at Sebastopol Community Park | 11 | 6 | Yes |
| Matanzas Creek at Doyle Park and Bethards Drive | 8 | 7 | Yes |
| Santa Rosa Creek at Wildwood Drive, Highway 12, upstream of Rincon Creek, at Alderbrook Drive, and at Railroad Street | 61 | 50 | Yes |

 $^{^*}$ Number of 30-day periods that exceed either the geometric mean criterion (126 cfu/100mL) or the statistical threshold value (410 cfu/100mL).

Assessment of *Bacteroides* **Bacteria Concentrations**

Bacteroides bacteria are another group of pathogen indicator organisms that are used to measure fecal contamination. *Bacteroides* bacteria is the genus name of the bacteria from the phylum Bacteroidetes and order Bacteroidales. Bacteroides bacteria contribute a significant fraction of the fecal bacteria species in animal feces. *Bacteroides* bacteria are anaerobic (i.e., they do not live or grow in the presence of oxygen) and make up a substantial portion of the gastrointestinal flora of mammals. *Bacteroides* bacteria are not found in ambient surface waters without sources of mammalian waste.

Due to their anaerobic-nature, *Bacteroides* bacteria have a low potential for survival and regrowth in the environment. In addition, water temperature has been shown to affect the persistence of *Bacteroides* bacteria in surface water (Kreader 1998; Bell et al. 2009). For water temperatures typically observed in the Russian River during the summer period, *Bacteroides* bacteria would survive only one day. Because of their short life span, *Bacteroides* bacteria concentrations are often used to indicate recent fecal contamination of surface waters.

Quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) methods were used to measure the concentration of *Bacteroides* bacteria by amplifying specific DNA sequences. In addition, the use of a host-specific genetic marker (16S rRNA) can also quantify the percentage of the *Bacteroides* bacteria population that originates from specific animalhosts (i.e., human and bovine) (Molina 2007).

Numeric criteria for *Bacteroides* bacteria are not available as epidemiological studies have not yet been conducted to link concentrations to illness rates. However, U.S. EPA (2012) supports the development of *Bacteroides* bacteria criteria where site-specific information exists. In this assessment, the measurement of quantifiable concentrations of human-host or bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria was used to assess compliance with the narrative Water Quality Objective of the *Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region* (NCRWQCB 2011), which is also known as the Basin Plan. The narrative Water Quality Objective states:

"The bacteriological quality of waters of the North Coast Region shall not be degraded beyond natural background levels."

Regional Water Board staff collected water samples for measurement of human-host and bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria at numerous mainstem and tributary locations in the Russian River Watershed from 2011 to 2013 (NCRWQCB 2012; NCRWQCB 2013a; NCRWQCB 2013b). Data were compared to the *Bacteroides* bacteria numeric evaluation threshold of no quantitative reported concentration. The quantitative reporting limits for human-host and bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria concentrations used in this assessment were 60 and 30 16SrRNA genes per 100mL, respectively. The median concentrations measured at each of these locations are shown in Tables 3 through 6. In addition, the number of samples measured below the quantitative reporting limits is identified at each location.

The assessment of the *Bacteroides* bacteria data shows that human-caused bacteria concentrations in the Russian River Watershed are widespread. All locations sampled in the mainstem Russian River and most tributary locations resulted in measureable levels of both human-host and bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria concentrations. Of the 179 samples collected for human-host *Bacteroides* bacteria, only five percent were measured below the numeric evaluation threshold. Of the 83 samples collected for bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria, only five percent were measured below the numeric evaluation threshold.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that natural background levels of bacteriological quality are not being achieved in the mainstem Russian River and its tributaries, in violation of the Basin Plan's narrative Bacteria Water Quality Objective.

Table 3. Human-Host Bacteroides Bacteria Concentrations Measured in the Russian River

| Location | Median Human- host Bacteroides (genes/100mL) | Number of Measurements | Number of Measurement s less than the Numeric Evaluation Threshold (60 genes per 100mL) |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| East Fork at East Road, Potter Valley | 5,949 | 3 | 0 |
| East School Way, Redwood Valley | 979 | 3 | 0 |
| Lake Mendocino Drive, Ukiah | 3,275 | 3 | 0 |
| Vichy Springs Road, Ukiah | 11,803 | 3 | 0 |
| Talmadge Road, Ukiah | 9,293 | 3 | 0 |
| River Road, Hopland | 1,898 | 3 | 0 |
| Commisky Station Road, Cloverdale | 2,731 | 2 | 0 |
| River Park, Cloverdale | 1,087 | 2 | 0 |
| Hwy 128 Bridge, Geyserville | 13,501 | 2 | 0 |
| Jimtown Bridge, Healdsburg | 37,052 | 2 | 0 |
| Camp Rose Beach, Healdsburg | 31,055 | 2 | 0 |
| Veteran's Memorial Beach, Healdsburg | 14,921 | 8 | 0 |
| Steelhead Beach, Forestville | 48,485 | 2 | 0 |
| River Access Beach, Forestville | 57,554 | 2 | 0 |
| Johnson's Beach, Guerneville | 1,677 | 10 | 0 |
| Monte Rio Beach, Monte Rio | 8,898 | 16 | 0 |
| Public Boat Ramp, Jenner | 4,837 | 2 | 0 |

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} Table 4. Human-Host {\it Bacteroides} & Bacteria Concentrations Measured in Russian River Tributaries \\ \end{tabular}$

| Stream | Location | Median Human- host Bacteroides (genes/100mL) | Number of Measurement S | Number of Measurements less than the Numeric Evaluation Threshold (60 genes per 100mL) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Abramson Creek | Willowside Road Path, Santa Rosa | 273,401 | 4 | 0 |
| Blucher Creek | Lone Pine Road, Cotati | 18,022 | 2 | 0 |
| Copeland Creek | Commerce Blvd, Rohnert Park | 19,928 | 2 | 0 |
| Crane Creek | Snyder Lane, Rohnert Park | 26,703 | 2 | 0 |
| Dutch Bill Creek | Main Street, Monte Rio | 416 | 2 | 1 |
| Foss Creek | Matheson Street, Healdsburg | 37,346 | 2 | 0 |
| Gossage Creek | Stony Glen Lane, Cotati | 29,902 | 2 | 0 |
| Green Valley Creek | Martinelli Road, Forestville | 17,016 | 2 | 0 |
| Laguna de Santa Rosa | Community Center, Sebastopol | 7,469 | 2 | 0 |
| Mays Creek | Neeley Road, Guerneville | 1,325 | 2 | 0 |
| Palmer Creek | Palmer Creek Road, Healdsburg | 2,781 | 2 | 1 |
| Piner Creek | Fulton Road, Santa Rosa | 12,394 | 2 | 0 |
| Santa Rosa Creek | Hwy 12 Bridge, Santa Rosa | 2,727 | 2 | 0 |
| Santa Rosa Creek | Railroad Street, Santa Rosa | 32,909 | 2 | 0 |
| Van Buren Creek | Erland Road, Santa Rosa | 2,089 | 2 | 1 |

 $\label{thm:continued} \textbf{Table 4} \ \textit{continued}. \ \textbf{Human-Host} \ \textit{Bacteroides} \ \textbf{Bacteria} \ \textbf{Concentrations} \ \textbf{Measured} \ \textbf{in} \ \textbf{Russian} \ \textbf{River Tributaries}$

| Stream | Location | Median Human- host Bacteroides (genes/100mL) | Number of Measurements | Number of Measurement s less than the Numeric Evaluation Threshold(60 genes per 100mL) |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Unnamed Creek | Lambert Bridge Road, Healdsburg | 5,257 | 2 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Fitch Mountain Road, Healdsburg | 238 | 6 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Fredson Road, Healdsburg | 8,580 | 5 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | West Dry Creek Road, Healdsburg | 4,040 | 5 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Alexander Valley Road, Healdsburg | 2,031 | 5 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Redwood Drive, Healdsburg | 2,310 | 5 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Limerick Road, Healdsburg | 20,000 | 4 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Summerhome Park Road, Forestville | 7,975 | 4 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Trenton Road, Forestville | 48,200 | 5 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Del Rio Court, Forestville | 3,460 | 3 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | River Road, Rio Nido | 3,600 | 3 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Foothill Dive, Monte Rio | 371,000 | 1 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Duncan Road, Monte Rio | 353 | 3 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Old Monte Rio Road, Monte Rio | 25,100 | 4 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Main Street, Monte Rio | 1,392 | 5 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Moscow Road, Duncans Mills | <60 | 1 | 1 |
| Unnamed Creek | Lakeside Ave, Camp Meeker | 9,090 | 4 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Sanford Road, Sebastopol | 1,576 | 4 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | Daywalt Road, Cotati | 37,632 | 2 | 0 |
| Unnamed Creek | River Road, Fulton | 2,759 | 4 | 0 |

Table 5. Summary of Bovine-Host Bacteroides Bacteria Concentrations Measured in the Russian River

| Location, Nearest City or Town | Median Bovine- host Bacteroides (genes/100mL) | Number of Measurements | Number of Measurement s less than the Numeric Evaluation Threshold (30 genes per 100mL) |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| Commisky Station Road, Cloverdale | 5,413 | 2 | 0 |
| River Park, Cloverdale | 710 | 2 | 0 |
| Hwy 128 Bridge, Geyserville | 236 | 2 | 0 |
| Jimtown Bridge, Healdsburg | 116 | 2 | 0 |
| Camp Rose Beach, Healdsburg | 286 | 2 | 0 |
| Veteran's Memorial Beach, Healdsburg | 381 | 2 | 0 |
| Steelhead Beach, Forestville | 23,684 | 2 | 0 |
| River Access Beach, Forestville | 14,710 | 2 | 0 |
| Johnson's Beach, Guerneville | 85 | 7 | 0 |
| Monte Rio Beach, Monte Rio | 762 | 10 | 0 |
| Public Boat Ramp, Jenner | 2,682 | 2 | 0 |

Table 6. Summary of Bovine-Host *Bacteroides* Bacteria Concentrations Measured in Russian River Tributaries

| Stream Location, Nearest City or Town | | Median Bovine-host Bacteroides (genes/100mL | Number of Measurements | Number of Measurements less than the Numeric Evaluation Threshold (30 genes per 100mL) | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|
| Abramson Creek | Willowside Road Path, Santa Rosa | 425,164 | 4 | 0 | |
| Blucher Creek | Lone Pine Road, Cotati | 177,248 | 2 | 0 | |
| Copeland Creek | Commerce Blvd, Rohnert Park | 51,685 | 2 | 0 | |
| Crane Creek | Snyder Lane, Rohnert Park | 23,602 | 2 | 0 | |
| Dutch Bill Creek | Main Street, Monte Rio | 15 | 2 | 2 | |
| Foss Creek | Matheson Street, Healdsburg | 8,668 | 2 | 1 | |
| Gossage Creek | Stony Glen Lane, Cotati | 76,895 | 2 | 0 | |
| Green Valley Creek | Martinelli Road, Forestville | 72 | 2 | 0 | |
| Laguna de Santa Rosa | Community Center, Sebastopol | 514 | 2 | 1 | |
| Mays Creek | Neeley Road, Guerneville | 608 | 2 | 0 | |
| Palmer Creek | Palmer Creek Road, Healdsburg | 106 | 2 | 1 | |
| Piner Creek | Fulton Road, Santa Rosa | 3,274 | 2 | 0 | |
| Santa Rosa Creek | Hwy 12 Bridge, Santa Rosa | 181 | 2 | 0 | |
| Santa Rosa Creek | Railroad Street, Santa Rosa | 7,765 | 2 | 0 | |
| Van Buren Creek | Erland Road, Santa Rosa | 2,265 | 2 | 1 | |
| Unnamed Creek | Sanford Road, Sebastopol | 482 | 4 | 0 | |
| Unnamed Creek | Lambert Bridge Road, Healdsburg | 453 | 2 | 1 | |
| Unnamed Creek | Limerick Road, Healdsburg | 1,966 | 4 | 0 | |
| Unnamed Creek | Daywalt Road, Cotati | 867,503 | 2 | 1 | |
| Unnamed Creek | River Road, Fulton | 768 | 4 | 0 | |

Assessment of the Presence of Potential Pathogenic Bacteria

Technology has advanced to a point where the species in an entire bacterial community can be identified instead of just a single pathogen indicator bacteria groups or species. DNA sequence analysis can identify possible fecal sources by measuring the total diversity of the microbial communities in a water sample (Dubinsky et al. 2012). The PhyloChip™ (Second Genome, San Bruno CA) is a phylogenetic DNA microarray that uses 16S rRNA gene probes to identify nearly 60,000 different bacteria taxa in a single water sample. Analyzing all known bacteria taxa identified the presence of potential human pathogens found in the surface waters of the Russian River Watershed.

Over one-hundred water samples were collected and processed using the PhyloChip™ microarray resulting in detection of over 10,000 different bacteria taxa in the Russian River watershed between 2011 and 2013 (Dubinsky and Andersen 2014). These samples were collected concurrently with pathogen indicator bacteria samples collected by the North Coast Regional Water Board (NCRWQCB 2012, 2013a, 2013b).

Table 7 shows a list of ten (10) potential human pathogen taxa that were detected at various locations in the Russian River Watershed. Each of these pathogens is discussed below. Detection of pathogen related genes do not necessarily indicate that pathogenic strains are present, but that the bacteria community may or may not include the virulent strain. Detection of pathogen related genes do not necessarily indicate that pathogenic strains are present, but rather that closely related taxa are present that may or may not include the virulent strain. Additional analyses that specifically target pathogenic strains would be necessary to confirm their occurrence.

However, these measurements confirm that surface waters throughout the Russian River Watershed are potentially impaired with pathogenic bacteria.

Table 7. Summary of Human Pathogens Measured in Russian River Watershed

| | Number of Meas | Percent of | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| Pathogenic Bacteria | Mainstem Russian River | Tributaries | Samples with Detected Bacteria |
| Klebsiella pneumoniae | 10 | 23 | 42% |
| Proteus mirabili | 1 | 10 | 11% |
| Salmonella enterica | 1 | 9 | 10% |
| Serratia marcescens | 3 | 27 | 41% |
| Shigella flexneri | 0 | 15 | 16% |
| Staphylococcus epidermidis | 3 | 13 | 22% |
| Staphylococcus haemolyticus | 2 | 0 | 2% |
| Streptococcus sp. | 0 | 8 | 8% |
| Vibrio cholerae | 0 | 1 | 1% |
| Yersinia sp. | 4 | 7 | 15% |

Findings

Based on the assessment of bacteria concentrations measured in the Russian River Watershed and presented in this memorandum, Regional Water Board staff can make the following findings:

- REC-1 beneficial uses are impaired due to high *E. coli* bacteria concentrations in five (5) tributaries of the Russian River Watershed:
- Both human-host and bovine-host *Bacteroides* bacteria concentrations exceed the numeric evaluation threshold (i.e., quantitative reporting limits) throughout the Russian River Watershed. Based on these results, it can be concluded that natural background levels of bacteriological quality are not being achieved in violation of the Basin Plan narrative bacteria Water Quality Objective.
- Measurements confirm the presence of potential pathogenic bacteria in surface waters throughout the Russian River Watershed.

REFERENCES

Bell, A., Layton, A.C., McKay, L., Williams, D., Gentry, R., Sayler, G.S. 2009. Factors influencing the persistence of fecal *Bacteroides* in stream water. J. Environ. Qual. 38 (3): 1224–1232.

June 2, 2014

Butkus, S. 2013. Evaluation of the Averaging Period for Application of Fecal Indicator Bacteria Water Quality Criteria. Memorandum dated July 25, 2013 to the File: Russian River Pathogen TMDL Development and Planning, North Coast Water Quality Control Board. Santa Rosa, CA.

CSWRCB 2004. Water Quality Control Policy for Developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List. California State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

Dubinsky, E.A., L. Esmaili, J. R. Hulls, Y. Cao, J. F. Griffith and G. L. Andersen. 2012. Application of phylogenetic microarray analysis to discriminate sources of fecal pollution. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46:4340-4347.

Dubinsky, E., and G. Andersen. 2014. Russian River Human Impact Study PhyloChip Microbial Community Analysis. Final Report dated May 1, 2014. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA.

IDEXX. 2001. Colilert® Test Pack Procedures IDEXX Laboratories, Inc., Westbrook, Maine. (Available at http://www.idexx.com/view/xhtml/en_us/water/water-microbiology.jsf).

Kreader, C.A. 1998. Persistence of PCR-detectable *Bacteroides distasonis* from human feces in river water. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 64 (10): 4103–4105.

Molina, M. 2007. Evaluation of Selected DNA-based Technology in Impaired Watersheds Impacted by Fecal Contamination from Diverse Sources. Publication No. EPA/600/R-07/123. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) 2011. Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa CA.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). 2012. Russian River Pathogen TMDL – 2011-2012 Monitoring Report. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa, CA.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) 2013a. Russian River Pathogen TMDL: Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Impact Study Report. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Santa Rosa, CA. July 2013.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) 2013b. Russian River Pathogen TMDL: Beach Recreation Impact Study Report. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Santa Rosa, CA. November 2013.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (USEPA) 2003. Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants; Analytical Methods for Biological Pollutants in Ambient Waters; Final Rule. Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 139. FRL-7529-7.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (USEPA) 2012. Recreational Water Quality Criteria. Publication No. EPA 820-F-12-058. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.